

Thermal radiation from Lorentzian traversable wormholes.

Prado Martín-Moruno^{1,*} and Pedro F. González-Díaz^{1,†}

¹*Colina de los Chopos, Instituto de Física Fundamental,
Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Serrano 121, 28006 Madrid, Spain*

In this paper we show that, analogously to as it occurs for black holes, there exist three well-defined laws for Lorentzian wormhole thermodynamics and that these laws are related with a thermal phantom-like radiation process coming from the wormhole throat. It is argued that the existence of wormholes could be manifested by means such a radiation. These results are obtained by analyzing the Hayward formalism of spherically symmetric solutions containing trapping horizons, the phenomenon of phantom accretion onto wormholes and the development of phantom thermodynamics.

PACS numbers: 04.62.+v, 04.70.Dy

I. INTRODUCTION.

In a broad sense the term wormhole was coined by Misner and Wheeler [1] (see also Wheeler [2]) even though some other authors used the concept quite before, including Flamm [3], Weyl [4] and the so-called Einstein-Rosen bridge [5]. The research on wormholes continued later with the contributions of authors like e. g. Zipoy [6], Ellis [7], Bronnikov [8] and Clement [9]. Wormholes, which were both traversable and stable, were considered and studied by Morris and Thorne [10], who assumed that there can be traversable wormhole solutions and worked out some inferences about their properties. Throughout this paper we will use the term wormhole to mean a stable and traversable wormhole, unless otherwise stated. The fascinating property of these wormholes lies on the fact that besides describing short-cuts between two universes or two separate regions of one universe, if one lets one of their mouths to move relative to the other, they can be converted into time machines [11]. The main problem with such wormholes is, however, that one of the requirements that they must fulfill in order to be traversable from one mouth to the other is the absence of an event horizon, and this in turn implies that wormholes must be supported by some kind of the so-called “exotic matter”, characterized by violating the null energy condition. Even though this pathology has not caused the total neglect of these solutions, it has nevertheless led to the study of special cases where the necessary amount of this exotic matter could be minimized (see chapter 15 of [12]).

Recent astronomical data [13] indicate that the Universe could be dominated by a stuff which violates the null energy condition, dubbed phantom energy [14]. A crucial point about this uncovering is that such a phantom energy could well be the class of exotic matter which is required to support traversable wormholes [15, 16]. This result could be regarded to be one of the most powerful arguments in favor of the idea that wormholes

should no longer be regarded as just describing purely mathematical toy space-time models with interest only for science fictions writers, but also as plausible physical realities that could exist in the very spacetime fabric of our Universe. The realization of this fact has motivated a renaissance of the study of wormhole spacetimes, the special interest being the consideration of the possible accretion of phantom energy onto wormholes, which may actually cause the growth of the their mouths [17].

It is one of the main aims of the present paper considering the potential thermodynamical properties of Lorentzian traversable in principle wormholes. That idea can be motivated by the fact that even though the definition of an event horizon is no longer possible for such wormholes, actually one can still introduce for them the concept of a trapping horizon. Now, Hayward has emphasized the importance of characterizing black holes themselves through local considerations [18, 19, 20, 21], given that a global property like the event horizon can not be tested by observers. In this spirit, he constructed a formalism able to describe the thermodynamical properties of spherical, dynamical black holes based on the existence of trapping horizons. It follows then that the presence of trapping horizons in wormhole spacetimes would also allow such wormholes to be studied and shows the similar nature of black- and worm-hole [22], when both are characterized locally by means of outer trapping horizons that are spacelike or null and timelike, respectively. Therefore, the idea that wormholes may show some characteristics and properties which paralleled those already found in black holes, seems to be quite natural, including in particular a wormhole thermodynamics (as already suggested and later introduced by Hayward [22]) as well as a possible Hawking-like thermal radiation for wormholes which we will discuss in this paper.

Actually, a key idea of the present work is to note that the results relating to the accretion phenomenon [17], based in the Babichev et al. method [23], must complement those which can be extracted from the Hayward formalism [18, 19, 20, 21], so allowing a deeper understanding of the wormhole thermodynamics. That understanding, together with some results about phan-

*Electronic address: pra@imaff.cfmac.csic.es

†Electronic address: p.gonzalezdiaz@imaff.cfmac.csic.es

tom thermodynamics [24], would provide any possible Hawking-like radiation from wormholes with a well defined physical meaning.

The present work is outlined as follows: In Sec. II we firstly summarize some basic ideas about the Morris-Thorne wormhole and, secondly, the key concepts of the Hayward formalism. Such a formalism is applied to the Morris-Thorne wormhole in Sec. III. In Sec. IV we introduce a consistent characterization for dynamical wormholes, which will allow us to derive a thermal radiation and formulate a whole thermodynamics in Sec. V. Finally, in Sec. VI, the conclusions are summarized and further comments are added.

II. PRELIMINARIES.

A. The Morris-Thorne wormholes.

Morris and Thorne [10] worked out a general, static and spherically symmetric wormhole, which is both traversable and stable. Such a solution describes a throat connecting two asymptotically flat regions of the spacetime, without the presence of any event horizon, that is

$$ds^2 = e^{2\Phi(l)} dt^2 + dl^2 + r^2(l) [d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\varphi^2], \quad (1)$$

where the coordinate $-\infty < l < \infty$ and $\Phi(l)$ must be finite everywhere. The radius of the wormhole throat is the minimum of the function $r(l)$, r_0 , which we can suppose, without loss of generality, placed at $l = 0$; therefore $l < 0$ and $l > 0$ respectively cover the two asymptotically flat regions connected through the throat at $l = 0$. Note that the limit of $r(l)/|l|$ and $\Phi(l)$ when $l \rightarrow \pm\infty$ must equal unity and constant, respectively, in order to have an asymptotically flat spacetime. Although this spacetime can be easily interpreted by constructing an embedding diagram, it is also useful to express metric (1) in terms of Schwarzschild coordinates. So we have

$$ds^2 = e^{2\Phi(r)} dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{1 - K(r)/r} + r^2 [d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\varphi^2], \quad (2)$$

where two coordinate patches are needed now to cover the two asymptotically flat regions, each with $r_0 \leq r \leq \infty$. In Eq. (2) $\Phi(r)$ and $K(r)$ are the redshift function and the shape function, respectively in order to preserve asymptotic flatness, both such functions must tend to a constant value when the radial coordinate goes to infinity. The minimum radius r_0 corresponds to the throat, where $K(r_0) = r_0$ and the embedded surface is vertical. The proper radial distance is expressed by

$$l(r) = \pm \int_{r_0}^r \frac{dr^*}{\sqrt{1 - K(r^*)/r^*}}, \quad (3)$$

and must be finite throughout the whole spacetime, i. e., $K(r)/r \leq 1$.

Some constraints of interest regarding the exotic nature of the background material which supports this

spacetime can be deduced. The Einstein equations imply that the sign of the radial derivative of the shape function, $K'(r)$, should be the same as the sign of the energy density $\rho(r)$; in order to minimize the exoticity, therefore, it could be advisable to demand $K'(r) > 0$. On the other hand, the embedding surface must flare outward, so that $K'(r) < K(r)/r$ at or near the throat. This implies $p_r(r) + \rho(r) < 0$ on this regime, where $p_r(r)$ is the radial pressure of the material. So, the exotic matter which supports this wormhole spacetime violates the null energy condition, and this is of course a rather uncomfortable characteristic, at least classically. Nevertheless, some quantum effects, such as the Casimir effect, have been shown to violate this condition in nature, too.

As we have already mentioned in the Introduction, the above properties of exotic matter have undergone a certain remake and gaining of naturalness, originating from the discovery of the accelerated expansion of the Universe. In fact, such an accelerated expansion may very plausibly be explained by the existence of a fluid homogeneously distributed throughout the universe, known as phantom energy [14], with an equation of state $p = w\rho$ in which $w > -1$. Suskov [15] and Lobo [16] have extended the notion of phantom energy to inhomogeneous spherically symmetric spacetimes by regarding that the pressure related to the energy density through the equation of state parameter must be the radial pressure, calculating the transverse components by means of the Einstein equations. One can see [16] that a particular specification of the redshift and shape functions in metric (2) leads to a static phantom traversable wormhole solution (where no-dynamical evolution for the phantom energy is considered) which satisfies the above-mentioned conditions, in particular the outward flaring condition $K'(r_0) < 1$.

B. Trapping horizons.

In this subsection we summarize some of the concepts and the notation used in the Hayward formalism based on the dual-null dynamics applicable to spherical symmetric solutions [20]. The line-element of a spacetime with spherical symmetry can be generally written as

$$ds^2 = 2g_{+-} d\xi^+ d\xi^- + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad (4)$$

where r and g_{+-} are functions of the null coordinates (ξ^+, ξ^-) , related with the two preferred null normal directions of each symmetric sphere $\partial_{\pm} \equiv \partial/\partial\xi^{\pm}$, r is the so-called areal radius [20] and $d\Omega^2$ refers to the metric on the unit two-sphere. One can define the expansions as

$$\Theta_{\pm} = \frac{2}{r} \partial_{\pm} r, \quad (5)$$

Since the sign of $\Theta_+ \Theta_-$ is invariant, one can say that a sphere is trapped, untrapped or marginal if the product $\Theta_+ \Theta_-$ is bigger, less or equal to zero, respectively. If the orientation $\Theta_+ > 0$ and $\Theta_- < 0$ is locally fixed

on an untrapped sphere, then ∂_+ and ∂_- are also fixed as the outgoing and ingoing null normal vectors (or the contrary if the orientation $\Theta_+ < 0$ and $\Theta_- > 0$ is considered). A marginal sphere with $\Theta_+ = 0$ is future if $\Theta_- < 0$, past if $\Theta_- > 0$ and bifurcating¹ if $\Theta_- = 0$. This marginal sphere is outer if $\partial_- \Theta_+ < 0$, inner if $\partial_- \Theta_+ > 0$ and degenerate if $\partial_- \Theta_+ = 0$. A hypersurface foliated by marginal spheres is called a trapping horizon and has the same classification as the marginal spheres.

In spherical symmetric spacetimes a unified first law of thermodynamics can be formulated [20]. The gravitational energy in spaces with this symmetry is the Misner-Sharp energy [25] which can be defined by

$$E = \frac{1}{2}r(1 - \partial^a r \partial_a r) = \frac{r}{2}(1 - 2g^{+-}\partial_+ r \partial_- r). \quad (6)$$

This expression obviously must become $E = r/2$ on a trapping horizon (for properties of E see [26]).

On the other hand, there are two invariants constructed out of the energy-momentum tensor of the background fluid which can be easily expressed in these coordinates:

$$\omega = -g_{+-}T^{+-} \quad (7)$$

and the vector

$$\psi = T^{++}\partial_+ r \partial_+ + T^{--}\partial_- r \partial_-. \quad (8)$$

Then the first law of thermodynamics can be written in the following form

$$\partial_\pm E = A\psi_\pm + \omega\partial_\pm V, \quad (9)$$

where $A = 4\pi r^2$ is the area of the spheres of symmetry, which is a geometrical-invariant, and $V = 4\pi r^3/3$ is defined as the corresponding flat-space volume, dubbed as areal volume by Hayward [20]. The first term in the r.h.s. could be interpreted as an energy-supply term, i. e., this term produces a change in the energy of the spacetime due to the energy flux ψ generated by the surrounding material (which generates this geometry). The second term, $\omega\partial_\pm V$, behaves like a work term, something like the work that the matter content must do to support this configuration.

The Einstein equations of interest in terms the above coordinates are

$$\partial_\pm \Theta_\pm = -\frac{1}{2}\Theta_\pm^2 - \Theta_\pm \partial_\pm \log(-g_{+-}) - 8\pi T_{\pm\pm}, \quad (10)$$

$$\partial_\pm \Theta_\mp = -\Theta_+ \Theta_- + \frac{1}{r^2}g_{+-} + 8\pi T_{+-}. \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, Kodama [28] introduced a vector k which can be understood as a generalization from the stationary Killing vector in spherically symmetric spacetimes, reducing to it in the vacuum case.² That vector can be defined as

$$k = \text{curl}_2 r, \quad (12)$$

where the subscript 2 means referring to the two-dimensional space normal to the spheres of symmetry. One can express k in terms of the null-coordinates yielding

$$k = -g^{+-}(\partial_+ r \partial_- - \partial_- r \partial_+), \quad (13)$$

with norm

$$||k||^2 = \frac{2E}{r} - 1. \quad (14)$$

This vector provides the trapping horizon with the additional definition of a hypersurface where the Kodama vector is null. Therefore, such as it happens in the case of static spacetimes, where a boundary can be generally defined as the hypersurface where the temporal Killing vector is null, in the present case we must instead use the Kodama vector. It can be seen that this vector generates a preferred flow of time and that E is its Noether charge. Moreover, k has some special properties [19] similar to those of a Killing vector on a static spacetime with boundaries, so allowing the definition of a generalized surface gravity, given by

$$\kappa = \frac{E}{r^2} - 4\pi r\omega, \quad (15)$$

satisfying

$$k \cdot (\nabla \wedge k^b) = \pm \kappa k^b \text{ on a trapping horizon.} \quad (16)$$

It is worth noticing at this stage that the generalized surface gravity can be equivalently expressed as

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{2}g^{ab}\partial_a \partial_b r. \quad (17)$$

It follows that outer, degenerate and inner trapping horizons have $\kappa > 0$, $\kappa = 0$ and $\kappa < 0$, respectively.

The Kodama vector was initially introduced in this formalism by Hayward as an analogue of the temporal Killing vector in dynamical, spherically symmetric spacetimes. Such a vector gets even further interest in the case of wormhole spacetimes. Although there is a temporal Killing vector for static traversable wormholes, it is not vanishing everywhere, so precluding the introduction of a Killing horizon, where one could try to define a surface gravity. However, the definition of the Kodama vector

¹ It must be noted that on the first part of this work we will consider future and past trapping horizons with $\Theta_+ = 0$, implying that ξ^- must be related to the ingoing or outgoing null normal direction for future ($\Theta_- < 0$) or past ($\Theta_- > 0$) trapping horizons, respectively.

² It must be emphasized that we have referred to the vacuum case, not to the more general static case.

and whereby the existence of a trapping horizon imply the existence of the generalized surface gravity in static and dynamic traversable wormholes, as we will see in the next section.

Finally, one can project Eq.(9) along the trapping horizon to obtain

$$L_z E = \frac{\kappa L_z A}{8\pi} + \omega L_z V, \quad (18)$$

where $L_z = z \cdot \nabla$ and $z = z^+ \partial_+ + z^- \partial_-$ is tangent to the trapping horizon. This expression allows us to introduce a relation between the geometric entropy and the surface area

$$S \propto A|_H. \quad (19)$$

III. HAYWARD FORMALISM APPLIED TO MORRIS-THORNE WORMHOLES.

The Hayward formalism was introduced for defining the properties of real black holes in terms of measurable quantities. It allows for a formulation of the thermodynamics of dynamical black holes which consistently recovers the results obtained by global considerations using the event horizon in the vacuum static case. It is in this sense that such a formalism can be regarded as a generalization, provided that the local quantities are physically meaningful both in static and dynamical spacetimes. A nice and rather surprising feature appears when one realizes that the Morris-Thorne wormhole (where it is not possible to infer any property similar to those found in black hole physics using global considerations) shows thermodynamical characteristics similar to those of black holes if local quantities are considered. That can be better understood if one notices that the Schwarzschild black hole is the only spherically symmetric solution in the vacuum, and therefore, any dynamical generalizations of black holes must be formulated in the presence of some matter content. The maximal extension of the Schwarzschild spacetime can be understood as a pair black-white hole, or an Einstein-Rosen bridge, which corresponds to a vacuum solution which describes a wormhole and has associated a given thermodynamics. Nevertheless, the Einstein-Rosen bridge can not be traversed since it has an event horizon. If we consider wormholes which in principle are traversable even in the static case, that is Morris-Thorne wormholes, some matter content must be present to support their structure. So the necessity of a formulation in terms of local quantities, measurable for an observer with finite life, must be related to the presence of some matter content, rather than with a dynamical evolution of the spacetime. In this section we apply the results obtained by Hayward for spherically symmetric solutions to static wormholes and rigorously show their consequences, some of which were already suggested and/or indicated by Ida and Hayward himself [27].

In order to re-express metric (2) in the form given by Eq. (4), a possible choice of the null-coordinates results from taking $\xi^+ = t + r_*$ and $\xi^- = t - r_*$, with r_* such that $dr/dr_* = \sqrt{-g_{00}/g_{rr}} = e^{\Phi(r)} \sqrt{1 - K(r)}/r$, and ξ^+ and ξ^- being respectively related with the outgoing and ingoing radiation. By the definitions introduced in the previous section, one can readily note that there is a bifurcating trapping horizon at $r = r_0$, which is outer whenever $K'(r_0) < 1$ (which must be satisfied by the outward flaring condition).

The Misner-Sharp energy, “energy density” and “energy flux” are respectively given by

$$E = \frac{K(r)}{2}, \quad (20)$$

$$\omega = \frac{\rho - p_r}{2} \quad (21)$$

and

$$\psi = -\frac{(\rho + p_r)}{2} e^{-\Phi(r)} \sqrt{1 - K(r)}/r (-1, 1). \quad (22)$$

It can be noticed that $E = r/2$ only at the throat (trapping horizon) and that, as in the case of Sushkov [15] and Lobo [16], no information about the transverse components of the pressure is needed. Now, Eq. (9) for the first law can be particularized to the Morris-Thorne case whenever we introduce the following quantities

$$\partial_{\pm} E = \pm 2\pi r^2 \rho e^{\Phi} \sqrt{1 - K(r)}/r \quad (23)$$

and

$$\psi_{\pm} = \pm e^{\Phi(r)} \sqrt{1 - K(r)}/r \frac{\rho + p_r}{4}. \quad (24)$$

Obviously, all terms in Eq.(9) should vanish at the horizon in the static case, i.e., the throat of the Morris-Thorne wormhole has no dynamical evolution. When compared with those of the black hole case, however, the study of the above quantities could give us some deeper understanding of such a spacetime which is based on the presence of the exotic matter. We stress first of all that the variation of the gravitational energy would always be positive in the outgoing direction and negative in the ingoing direction because³ $\rho > 0$. It follows that in this case the exoticity or not exoticity of the matter content is not important for the result. The “energy density” ω ,

³ It is worth noting that $e^{\Phi} \sqrt{1 - K(r)}/r \equiv \alpha$ appears by explicitly considering the Morris-Thorne solution, where $\alpha = \sqrt{-g_{00}/g_{rr}}$ is a general factor at least in spherically symmetric, static cases; therefore it has the same sign as in the case of a static black hole surrounded by ordinary matter without dynamical evolution. We will assume that in the dynamical cases of black and worm-holes α keeps the sign unchanged relative to the one appearing in Eqs.(23) and (24) outside the throat.

which is non-negative for static or dynamic black holes, actually is positive even though the energy conditions are not fulfilled. The key differentiating point appears when one considers the energy-supply term because the energy flux depends on the sign of $\rho + p_r$; whereas in case of usual ordinary matter that could be interpreted as a fluid which “gives” energy to the spacetime, for exotic matter the fluid “receives” or “gets” energy from the spacetime. It must be noted that the “energy removal”, induced by the energy flux term in the wormhole case, can never be large enough to make the variation of the gravitational energy changes sign.

The spacetime (2) possesses a temporal Killing vector which is non-vanishing everywhere, and therefore it makes no sense trying to find a surface gravity as used by Gibbons and Hawking [29] for Killing horizons. However, spherical symmetry would still allow us to consider the Kodama vector with components

$$k^\pm = e^{-\Phi(r)} \sqrt{1 - K(r)/r}, \quad (25)$$

with $||k||^2 = 0$ at the throat. It follows that a generalized surface gravity as defined in Eq.(15) can yet be obtained

$$\kappa|_H = \frac{1 - K'(r_0)}{4r_0}, \quad (26)$$

where “ $|_H$ ” means evaluation at the horizon. It can be noted that, since the throat is an outer trapping horizon ($K'(r_0) < 1$), the surface gravity is positive, as it should be expected from the very definition of surface gravity (17).

It is well known that when the surface gravity is defined by the use of a temporal Killing vector, this quantity is understood to mean that there is a force acting on test particles in a gravitational field. The generalized surface gravity is in turn defined by the use of the Kodama vector which determines a preferred flow of time, reducing to the Killing vector in the vacuum case and recovering the surface gravity its usual meaning. However, in the case of a spherically symmetric and static wormhole one can define both, the temporal Killing and the Kodama vector, being the Kodama vector of greater interest since it vanishes at a particular surface. Moreover, in dynamical spherically symmetric cases one can only define the Kodama vector. Therefore we could suspect that the generalized surface gravity should originate some effect on test particles which would go beyond that corresponding to a force, and only reducing to it in the vacuum case. On the other hand, if by some kind of symmetry this effect on a test particle would vanish, then we should think that such a symmetry would also produce that the trapping horizon be degenerated.

IV. DYNAMICAL WORMHOLES.

The existence of a well-defined surface gravity and the possible identification of the first term in the r.h.s of Eq.

(18) to something proportional to an entropy seems to suggest the possibility that a proper wormhole thermodynamics can be formulated, as it was already commented in Ref. [22]. Nevertheless, a more precise definition of the dynamical wormhole horizon must be done in order to settle down univocally its characteristics. To get that aim we first have to comment on the results obtained for the increase of the black hole area [21], comparing then them with those derived from the accretion method [23], which would be expected to lead to additional information in the case of wormholes.

First, the area of a surface can be expressed in terms of the area 2-form μ as $A = \int_S \mu$, with $\mu = r^2 \sin \theta d\theta d\varphi$ in the spherically symmetric case. Therefore, one can study the evolution of the area by using

$$L_z A = \int_S \mu (z^+ \Theta_+ + z^- \Theta_-), \quad (27)$$

with z tangent to the considered surface.

On the other hand, by the very definition of a trapping horizon we can fix $\Theta_+|_H = 0$, which leads to a description of the evolution of the horizon through

$$L_z \Theta_+|_H = [z^+ \partial_+ \Theta_+ + z^- \partial_- \Theta_+]|_H = 0. \quad (28)$$

Then, one can also note that by evaluating Eq.(10) at the trapping horizon we can obtain

$$\partial_+ \Theta_+|_H = -8\pi T_{++}|_H, \quad (29)$$

with $T_{++} \propto \rho + p_r$. Therefore, if it is a ordinary matter that is supporting the spacetime, then one has $\partial_+ \Theta_+|_H < 0$ but if we have exotic matter instead, then $\partial_+ \Theta_+|_H > 0$.

Characterizing black holes by the presence of a future outer trapping horizon implies the growth of its area, provided that its matter content satisfies the classical dominant energy conditions [21]. This is easily seen by taking into account the definition of outer trapping horizon and by realizing that, when introduced in condition (28), Eq.(29), for ordinary matter, implies that the sign of z^+ and z^- must be different, i.e. outer trapping horizons are achronal in the presence of ordinary matter. Then, evaluating $L_z A$ at the horizon, taking into account that the black hole horizon is future and considering that z has a positive component along the future-pointing direction of vanishing expansion, $z^+ > 0$, one finally obtains that⁴ $L_z A \geq 0$. It is worth noticing that when exotic matter is accreted, then the previous reasoning would imply that the black hole area must decrease.

Whereas the characterization of black holes following the above lines appears to be rather natural, a reasonable doubt may still be kept about how the outer trapping horizon of wormholes may be considered. Since a traversable wormhole should necessarily be described

⁴ In the case of white holes, we have a past outer trapping horizon and therefore $L_z A \leq 0$.

in the presence of exotic matter, the above considerations imply that its trapping horizon should be timelike. However, if the timelike trapping horizon is future (past) then, by Eq. (27), its area would decrease (increase). Of course its area should remain constant in the static case, as in that case the horizon must be bifurcating.

A consistent choice between these two possibilities can be done by recalling what happens in the process of dark energy accretion onto black holes, Ref. [23]. In fact, that process leads to an unavoidable decrease (increase) of their area if $p + \rho < 0$ ($p + \rho > 0$), where p could be identified to p_r in our case. Since the phantom energy can be considered as a particular case of exotic matter [15, 16], we recover again the same result as in the precedent paragraph, that is, both formalism can be shown to describe the same mechanism. The method of Babichev et al., Ref. [23], can also be applied to wormholes [17], obtaining that the size of the wormhole throat must increase by the accretion of phantom energy and decrease if $p + \rho > 0$. That result could have been suspected from the onset since, if the phantom energy can be regarded as the kind of matter which supports wormholes, it becomes quite a reasonable implication that the wormhole throat must decrease in size if matter with the opposite internal energy is accreted, getting, on the contrary, on bigger sizes when phantom energy is accreted. It follows that one must characterize dynamical wormholes by their past outer trapping horizon, so implying that $L_z A > 0$.

It also follows then that, whereas the characterization of a black hole must be done in terms of its future trapping horizon (as such a black hole would tend to be static as one goes into the future, ending its evolution at infinity), that of a white hole, which is assumed to have born static and then allowed to evolve, should be done in terms of its past horizon. Thus, in the case of a wormhole one can consider a picture of it being born at the beginning of the universe (or when an advanced civilization constructs it at some later moment) and then left to evolve, increasing or decreasing its size when there is a higher proportion of exotic or ordinary matter, respectively. Therefore, taking the past horizon to characterize the wormholes appears to be consistent with this picture.

The above mentioned conclusion is in agreement as well with the idea that phantom energy is equivalent to usual energy traveling backward in time, which seems to somehow imply that a wormhole spacetime supported by phantom energy could be physically equivalent to a black hole spacetime supported by ordinary matter defined in an reversed time. In fact, a time reversed future horizon would necessarily become a past horizon. It must be emphasized that in this argument we are considering black holes surrounded by ordinary matter. Static black holes can be purely vacuum solutions which are invariant under time reversal. But these vacuum black holes would be compared to purely vacuum wormholes, which, in turn, should also be invariant under time reversal. In particular, and since we are concerned with spherically symmetric spacetimes, one could consider the

Einstein-Rosen bridge, which is a purely vacuum (non-traversable) wormhole; that wormhole is not only invariant under time reversal, but it has the same properties as Schwarzschild black hole since it is nothing but an extension of that spacetime. So, we can conclude that the time invariance should be broken when any kind of matter is present, i. e., when we have a non-vanishing r.h.s in Einstein equations.

On the other hand, taking into account the proportionality relation (19) we can see that the dynamical evolution of the wormhole entropy must be such that $L_z S \geq 0$, which saturates only at the static case.

V. WORMHOLE THERMAL RADIATION AND THERMODYNAMICS.

The existence of a non-vanishing surface gravity at the wormhole throat seems to imply that it can be characterized by a non-zero temperature so that one would expect that wormholes should emit some sort of thermal radiation. Of course, we are considering two-way traversable wormholes and, therefore, any matter or radiation could pass through it from one universe to another (or from a region to another of a single universe) finally appearing in the latter universe (or region). What we are refereeing to, nevertheless, is a completely different kind of radiative phenomenon. One can distinguish that phenomenon from that implying a radiation traveling through the wormhole because whereas the latter phenomenon follows a path which is allowed by classical general relativity, thermal radiation is an essentially quantum-mechanical process. Therefore, even in the case that no matter or radiation would travel through the wormhole classically, the existence of a trapping horizon would produce a quantum thermal radiation.

In Ref. [30] the use of a Hamilton-Jacobi variant of the Parikh-Wilczek tunneling method led to a local Hawking temperature in the case of spherically symmetric black holes. It was however also suggested [30] that this method was only applicable to a future outer trapping horizon, since non physical meaning could be addressed to the case of horizons other than the past inner trapping horizons. Notwithstanding, although the past outer trapping horizon belongs to the first of the latter cases, it actually describes physically allowable dynamical wormholes. Thus, in this section we apply the method considered in Ref. [30] to past outer trapping horizon and show that the result advanced in the precedent paragraph is physically consistent, provided we take into account the pre-suppositions and results derived [24] for phantom energy thermodynamics.

Let us consider a dynamical, spherically symmetric wormhole, described by the metric given in Eq. (4), hav-

ing a past trapping horizon with $\Theta_- = 0$ and⁵ $\Theta_+ > 0$. In order to study any possible thermal radiation emitted by that spacetime tunnel, we can express metric (4) in terms of the generalized retarded Eddington-Finkelstein coordinates

$$ds^2 = -e^{2\Psi} C du^2 - 2e^\Psi du dr + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad (30)$$

where $u = \xi^-$ and $d\xi^+ = \partial_u \xi^+ du + \partial_r \xi^+ dr$. Since $\partial_r \xi^+ > 0$, we have considered $e^\Psi = -g_{+-} \partial_u \xi^+$ and $e^{2\Psi} C = -2g_{+-} \partial_u \xi^+$, with $C = 1 - 2E/r$, E being defined by Eq. (6), and Ψ expressing the gauge freedom in the choice of the null coordinate u . The use of retarded coordinates ensures that the marginal surfaces, for which $C = 0$, actually are past marginal surfaces.

Now, similarly to as it has been done in Ref.[30], we consider a massless scalar field in the eikonal approximation, $\phi = \phi_0 \exp(iI)$, with a slowly varying amplitude and a rapidly varying action given by

$$I = \int \omega_\phi e^\Psi du - \int k_\phi dr, \quad (31)$$

which, in our case, actually describes radially outgoing radiation. Infalling radiation would in fact require the use of advanced coordinates instead. The wave equation $\nabla^2 \phi = 0$ in turn implies

$$g^{ab} \nabla_a I \nabla_b I = 0, \quad (32)$$

which, taking into account that $\partial_u I = e^\Psi \omega_\phi$ and $\partial_r I = -k$, leads to

$$k_\phi^2 C + 2\omega_\phi k_\phi = 0. \quad (33)$$

One solution of Eq. (33) is $k = 0$. This must correspond to outgoing modes, as we are considering that ϕ is outgoing. Therefore, the alternate solution, $k = -2\omega_\phi/C < 0$, should correspond to the ingoing modes. Since C vanishes on the horizon, the action (31) has a pole. Noting that $\kappa|_H = \partial_r C/2$, where, without loss of generality, we have taken $\Psi = 0$. Given that $\kappa|_H$ should be gauge-invariant, with expanding C , one obtains $k_\phi \approx -\omega_\phi / [\kappa|_H(r - r_0)]$. Therefore the action has an imaginary contribution which is obtained deforming the contour of integration in the upper r half-plane

$$\text{Im}(I)|_H = -\frac{\pi\omega_\phi}{\kappa|_H}. \quad (34)$$

One can take the particle production rate as given by the WKB approximation of the tunneling probability Γ along a classically forbidden trajectory

$$\Gamma \propto \exp[-2\text{Im}(I)]. \quad (35)$$

Although the traversing path of a traversable wormhole is a classically allowed trajectory and that wormhole is interpretable as a two-way traversable membrane, we can consider that the existence of a trapping horizon opens the possibility for an additional quantum traversing phenomenon through the wormhole. This additional quantum radiation would be somehow based on some sort of quantum tunneling mechanism between the two involved universes (or the two regions of the same, single universe), a process which of course is classically forbidden. If such an interpretation is accepted, then (35) takes into account the probability of particle production rate at the trapping horizon induced by some quantum, or at least semi-classical, effect. Considering probability (35), the resulting thermal form $\Gamma \propto \exp(-\omega_\phi/T_H)$, would lead us to finally compute a temperature for the thermal radiation given by

$$T = -\frac{\kappa|_H}{2\pi}, \quad (36)$$

which is negative. At first sight, one could think that we could save ourselves from this negative temperature because it is related to the ingoing modes. However this can no longer be the case as this thermal radiation appears at the horizon, so again leading to a negative horizon temperature.

Even if one tries to avoid any possible physical implication for this negative temperature, claiming that it would be only a problem if one is at the horizon, one must take into account that the infalling radiation getting in one of the wormhole mouths would travel through that wormhole following a classical path to re-appear at the other mouth as an outgoing radiation in the other universe (or the other region of universe). Now, since the same phenomenon would take place at both mouths, in the end of the day it would be fully unavoidable that one finds outgoing radiation with negative temperature in the universe whenever a wormhole is present.

Moreover, as we have already discussed, phantom energy must be considered as a special case of exotic matter, and it is also known that phantom energy must always be characterized by a negative temperature [24]. Therefore, the above results should be taken to be a consistency proof of the used method as a negative radiation temperature simply express the feature to be expected that wormholes should emit a thermal radiation just of the same kind as that of the stuff supporting them, such as it also occurs with dynamical black holes with respect to ordinary matter and positive temperature. On the other hand, as we have indicated at the end of Sec. IV, phantom energy can be treated as ordinary matter traveling backward in time, and the wormhole horizon as a black hole horizon for reversed time, at least if we are considering the real, dynamical, case. One can also note that the retarded metric (30) which allows us to derive the negative temperature, is nothing but the time reversed line element obtained from the corresponding advanced metric, that is the spacetime driving thermal radiation

⁵ One could equivalently (following the notations and calculations used so far in this work) take $\Theta_+ = 0$ and $\Theta_- > 0$, and then ξ^+ (ξ^-) would describe ingoing (outgoing) radiation.

with positive temperature in the case of dynamical black holes. In this way, one could interpret this result by considering that only some fundamental quantity, such as the entropy, must be invariant under time reversal, but that quantities like temperature must change sign under time reversal $t \rightarrow -t$. Even more, taking into account (36), one can re-express Eq.(18) in the form

$$L_z E = -T L_z S + \omega L_z V \quad (37)$$

on the trapping horizon, so univocally defining the wormhole geometric entropy by

$$S = \frac{A|_H}{4}. \quad (38)$$

A negative sign for the first term in the r.h.s. of Eq.(37) is not surprising since, as already pointed out in Sec.III, the exotic matter which supports this spacetime gets energy from the spacetime itself, so the term for the energy supply must be negative. Following that line of reasoning we can now formulate the first law of wormhole thermodynamics as:

First law: The change in the gravitational energy of a wormhole equals the sum of the energy removed from the wormhole plus the work done in the wormhole.

This can be interpreted by considering that the exotic matter is responsible for both the energy removal and the work done, the balance always giving rise to a positive variation of the total gravitational energy.

On the other hand, we have also shown in Sec. IV that $L_z A \geq 0$ and $L_z S \geq 0$, which saturate only at the static case. If we assume a real, cosmological wormhole created in a rather exotic dynamical background, we can formulate the second law for wormhole thermodynamics as follows

Second law: The entropy of a dynamical wormhole is given by its surface area which always increases.

Moreover, since by definition a wormhole can be characterized by a past outer trapping horizon, no dynamical evolution whatsoever can change the outer character of its horizon. In Ref.[22] it was considered that a wormhole could change its nature becoming a black hole, but even in the case that this process would be possible, the trapping horizon could never change from being outer or inner. This in turn implies that no dynamical evolution can change the sign of the surface gravity, so that we always have $\kappa > 0$. Therefore, if the trapping horizon remains being past, Eq. (36) must be valid, and $T < 0$. Now, from this argument we can straightforwardly formulate the third law of wormhole thermodynamic in two alternate ways

Third law (first formulation): It is impossible to reach the absolute zero for surface gravity by any dynamical process.

Third law (second formulation): In a wormhole it is impossible to reach the absolute zero of temperature by any dynamical process.

It is worth noticing that if by using some line of reasoning similar to that introduced in [22], it would be made

possible to change the horizon from being future to being past or vice versa, such a change would by equivalence between matter and geometry imply the change of the very nature of the equation of state of the surrounding matter⁶. Therefore, the first law of wormholes thermodynamics would then become the first law of black holes thermodynamics, where the energy is supplied by ordinary matter rather than by the exotic one and the minus sign in Eq.(37) is replaced by a plus sign. The latter implication arises from the feature that a future outer trapping horizon should produce thermal radiation at a positive temperature. The second law would remain then unchanged since it can be noted that the variation of the horizon area, and hence of the entropy, is equivalent for a past outer trapping horizon surrounded by exotic matter and for a future outer trapping horizon surrounded by ordinary matter.

Finally, the two formulations provided for the third law would also be the same, but in the second formulation one would consider that the temperature took only on positive values.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER COMMENTS.

In this work we have applied results related to a generalized first law of thermodynamics [20] and the existence of a generalized surface gravity [20, 27] to the case of the Morris-Thorne wormholes [10], where the outer trapping horizon is bifurcating. Since these wormholes correspond to static solutions, no dynamical evolution of the throat is of course allowed, with all terms entering the first law vanishing at the throat. However, the comparison of the involved quantities (such as the variation of the gravitational energy and the energy-exchange so as work terms as well) with the case of black holes surrounded by ordinary matter actually provide us with some useful information about the nature of this spacetime (or alternatively about the exotic matter), under the assumption that in the dynamical cases these quantities keep the signs unchanged relative to those appearing outside the throat in the static cases. It follows that the variation of the gravitational energy and the “work term”, which could be interpreted as the work carried out by the matter content in order to maintain the spacetime, have the same sign in spherically symmetric spacetimes

⁶ It can be noted that the argument used in Ref. [22] about the possible conversion of a past outer trapping horizon (i.e. a wormhole which is bounded by this horizon) into a future outer trapping horizon (i.e. a black hole which is bounded by this horizon) and vice versa, are just based on an unavoidable previous change of the surrounding matter equation of state, bringing exotic matter into ordinary matter or vice versa. From the equivalence between the matter content and the geometry, one can then rise the question: what is first, the egg or the hen?

supported by both ordinary and exotic matter. Notwithstanding, the “energy-exchange term” would be positive in the case of dynamical black holes surrounded by ordinary matter (i. e. it is an energy supply) and negative for dynamical wormholes surrounded by exotic matter (i. e. it corresponds to an energy removal).

It must be also emphasized that the Kodama vector, which allows us to introduce a generalized surface gravity in dynamic spherically symmetric spacetimes [20], must be taken into account not only in the case of dynamical solutions, but also in the more general case of non-vacuum solutions. In fact, whereas the Kodama vector reduces to the temporal Killing in the spherically symmetric vacuum solution (Schwarzschild), that reduction is no longer possible for static non-vacuum solutions. That differentiation is a key ingredient in the case of wormholes, where even for the static Morris-Thorne case there is no Killing horizon in spite of having a temporal Killing vector and possessing a non degenerate trapping horizon. This in turn implies a non-vanishing generalized surface gravity based on local concepts which have therefore potentially observable consequences.

On the other hand, noting that the variation of the black hole size obtained by using the Hayward formalism [21] for dynamical black holes is equivalent to that variation coming from the consideration of dark energy accretion onto black holes [23], we have assumed that these two variations actually are alternate approaches in order to describe the same, unique phenomenon. When applied to wormholes such an identification leads to the characterization of such wormholes in terms of the past outer trapping horizons. That characterization would imply that the area (and hence the entropy) of a dynamical wormhole always increases if there are no changes in the exoticity of the background (second law of wormhole thermodynamics) and that the hole appears to thermally radiate with negative temperature. There must not be any problem with the physical meaning of this radiation, because phantom energy itself is also associated with a negative temperature. It is quite a natural conclusion that the wormhole would emit radiation of the same kind as the matter which supports it, such as it occurs in the case of dynamical black hole evaporation with respect to ordinary matter.

These considerations allow us to consistently reinterpret the generalized first law of thermodynamics as formulated by Hayward [20] in the case of wormholes, noting that in this case the change in the gravitational energy of the wormhole throat is equal to the sum of the energy removed from the wormhole and the work done on the wormhole (first law of wormholes thermodynamics), a result which is consistent with the above mentioned results obtained by analyzing of the Morris-Thorne spacetime.

It is worth noticing that because once the past outer trapping horizon is settled to characterize a wormhole, it will always remain outer, it becomes impossible that the surface gravity reaches an absolute zero along any

dynamical processes (third law of wormhole thermodynamics). This result would imply that if the trapping horizon remains past, the wormhole throat would always have a temperature $T < 0$, whereas if the trapping horizon would change to be future, then we had a black hole with positive temperature [30], the temperature never reaching a zero value in any case.

On the other hand, the idea that phantom energy can be viewed as just ordinary matter subject to time inversion becomes fully consistent whenever one takes into account that the dynamical wormhole horizon could likewise be treated as the time reversed form of the dynamical black hole horizon. In fact, the three laws of thermodynamical wormholes reduces to the three laws of black hole dynamics when one simply considers that time inversion renders exotic matter into ordinary matter supplying energy to the spacetime, so changing sign of temperature. It must be noted that in the purely vacuum case both, black hole and wormhole, should be invariant under time inversion with the r.h.s. of Einstein equations vanishing in both cases. In fact, such cases respectively correspond to e.g. the Schwarzschild black hole and to the Einstein-Rosen bridge. Nevertheless, the Einstein-Rosen bridge is a non-traversable wormhole; therefore, in order to compare a static traversable wormhole (Morris and Thorne) with a black hole, the latter solution must be static in the presence of ordinary matter. In such cases, although rigorously there is no dynamical evolution of the horizons, the correspondence between black hole and wormhole under time inversion can be already suspected from the onset.

We would like to remark that it is quite plausible that the existence of wormholes be partly based on the possible presence of phantom energy in our Universe. Of course, even though in that case the main part of the energy density of the universe would be contributed by phantom energy, a remaining 25% would still be made up of ordinary matter (dark or not). At least in principle, existing wormhole structures would be compatible with the configuration of such a universe, even though a necessarily sub-dominant proportion of ordinary matter be present, provided that the effective equation of state parameter of the universe be less than minus one.

At first sight, the above results might perhaps point out to a way through which wormholes might be localized in our environment by simply measuring the inhomogeneities implied phantom radiation, similarly to as initially thought for black hole Hawking radiation [29]. However, in both cases, at present, we are far from having hypothetical instruments sensitive and precise enough to detect any of the inhomogeneities and anisotropies which could be expected from the thermal emission from black holes and wormholes of moderate sizes.

After completion of this paper we became aware of a paper by Hayward [31] in which some part of the present work were also discussed following partly similar though somewhat divergent arguments.

Acknowledgments

P. M. M. thanks B. Alvarez and L. Pastor for encouragement and gratefully acknowledges the financial support

provided by the I3P framework of CSIC and the European Social Fund. This work was supported by MEC under Research Project No.FIS2008-06332/FIS.

-
- [1] C. W. Misner and J. A. Wheeler, *Annals Phys.* **2**, 525 (1957).
 - [2] J. A. Wheeler, *Phys. Rev.* **97**, 511 (1955).
 - [3] L. Flamm, *Phys. Z.* **17**, 448-454 (1916).
 - [4] H. Weyl, *Philosophie der Mathematik und Naturwissenschaft. Handbuch der philosophie.* Leibniz Verlag, Munich, 1928.
 - [5] A. Einstein and N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **48**, 73 (1935).
 - [6] D. M. Zipoy, *J. Math. Phys.* **7**, 1137 (1966).
 - [7] H. G. Ellis, *J. Math. Phys.* **14**, 104 (1973).
 - [8] K. A. Bronnikov, *Acta Phys. Pol.* **4**, 251 (1973).
 - [9] G. Clement, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **16**, 131 (1984).
 - [10] M. S. Morris and K. S. Thorne, *Am. J. Phys.* **56** 395 (1988).
 - [11] M. S. Morris, K. S. Thorne and U. Yurtsever, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1446 (1988).
 - [12] M. Visser, *Lorentzian Wormholes: from Einstein to Hawking*, AIP Press (1996).
 - [13] D. J. Mortlock and R. L. Webster, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **319**, 872 (2000); A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], *Astron. J.* **116**, 1009 (1998); S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], *Astrophys. J.* **517**, 565 (1999); J. L. Tonry *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], *Astrophys. J.* **594**, 1 (2003); D. N. Spergel *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 175 (2003); C. L. Bennett *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **148**, 1 (2003); M. Tegmark *et al.* [SDSS Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103501 (2004).
 - [14] R. R. Caldwell, "A Phantom Menace?," *Phys. Lett. B* **545**, 23 (2002); V. K. Onemli and R. P. Woodard, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** 4607 (2002); S. M. Carroll, M. Hoffman and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 023509 (2003); P. F. Gonzalez-Diaz, *Phys. Lett. B* **586**, 1 (2004).
 - [15] S. V. Sushkov, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 043520 (2005).
 - [16] F. S. N. Lobo, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 084011 (2005).
 - [17] P. F. González-Díaz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** 071301 (2004); P. F. González-Díaz and P. Martín-Moruno, *Proceedings of the eleventh Marcel Grossmann Meeting on General Relativity*, Editors: H. Kleinert, R. T. Jantzen and R. Ruffini, World Scientific, New Jersey 2190-2192 (2008).
 - [18] S. A. Hayward, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** 6467 (1994).
 - [19] S. A. Hayward, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 1938 (1996).
 - [20] S. A. Hayward, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15**, 3147 (1998).
 - [21] S. A. Hayward, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 104027 (2004).
 - [22] S. A. Hayward, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **8**, 373 (1999).
 - [23] E. Babichev, V. Dokuchaev and Yu. Eroshenko, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** 021102 (2004); E. Babichev, V. Dokuchaev and Y. Eroshenko, *J. Exp. Theor. Phys.* **100** 528 (2005) [*Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **127** 597 (2005)].
 - [24] P. F. Gonzalez-Diaz and C. L. Siguenza, *Nucl. Phys. B* **697**, 363 (2004); E. N. Saridakis, P. F. Gonzalez-Diaz and C. L. Siguenza, arXiv:0901.1213 [astro-ph].
 - [25] C. W. Misner and D. H. Sharp, *Phys. Rev.* **136** B571 (1964).
 - [26] S. A. Hayward, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 831 (1994).
 - [27] D. Ida and S. A. Hayward, *Phys. Lett. A* **260**, 175 (1999).
 - [28] H. Kodama, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **63**, 1217 (1980).
 - [29] G. W. Gibbons and S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 2738 (1977).
 - [30] S. A. Hayward, R. Di Criscienzo, L. Vanzo, M. Nadalini and S. Zerbini, arXiv:0806.0014 [gr-qc].
 - [31] S. A. Hayward, arXiv:0903.5438 [gr-qc].
 - [32] S. W. Hawking and G. F. R. Ellis, *The large scale structure of space-time.*, Cambridge University Press (1973).